

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 4-43 and 45-50 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 36, 38, 39, 45, and 46 have been amended. No new claims have been added or canceled. Therefore, claims 1, 4-43, and 45-50 are present for examination. Claims 1, 36, 38, 39, 45, and 46 are independent claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Java SE in view of Chen et al. and further in view of Friedman et al.

Claims 1, 4-18, 20-43 and 45-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Java™ 2 Platform, Standard Edition v1.2.2 API Specification” (“Java SE”) in view of “Specification-based Testing for GUI-based Applications” by Chen et al. (“Chen”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,171,588 issued to Friedman et al. (“Friedman”).

Java SE generally discloses an API specification for the Java 2 Platform, Standard Edition, version 1.2.2. This API specification includes a variety of Java packages, classes, methods, etc. Specifically, Java SE discloses a class “AccessibleContext” which represents the minimum information all accessible objects return. The information includes the accessible name, description, role, and state of the object. The AccessibleContext class includes a `getAccessibleAt(Point p)` method which returns an accessible child contained at the coordinate Point. AccessibleContext further includes the methods `getAccessibleComponent()`, `getAccessibleRole()` and `getAccessibleAction()`, which are used to manipulate an AccessibleContext object. (see Java SE at “class AccessibleContext” and “interface AccessibleComponent”). Ultimately, the AccessibleContext class allows for the retrieval of pointer data generated by an input device (e.g., a mouse).

Chen generally discloses specification-based testing for GUI-based applications; such “GUI-based applications are based on the Capture/Replay technique. With this technique, in the first run of an application, a Capture/Replay tool is used to record all interesting events in

a test script written in certain script languages. For input, [the test] records every point and click applied to the GUI application in a test script that is in C-like Test Script Language (TSL).” (Chen at page 207, section 2). Friedman discloses that the “JAVA programming language provides platform independence.” (Freidman at col. 2, ll. 12-13).

In contrast, claim 1 recites “a method of testing a software program comprising a plurality of components executed on one of a plurality of operating systems for compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements” which includes that “the accessibility context further includes a set of actions included in an action list which are configured to emulate a disabled user’s actions while interfacing with the software program.” Applicants submit that Java SE, Chen, and Freidman, individually, or when combined in any combination fail to teach or suggest an “accessibility context [that] includes a set of actions included in an action list which are configured to emulate a disabled user’s actions while interfacing with the software program.” None of the cited references teach or suggest a set of actions, or that those actions are configured to emulate a disabled user’s use of a software program. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Java SE, Chen, and Fiedman. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 36, 38, 39, 45, and 46 recite similar limitations to those of claim 1, and for at least the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 36, 38, 39, 45, and 46, are also allowable over the combination of Java SE, Chen, and Fiedman.

Dependent claims 4-35, 37, 40-43 and 47-50 depend from independent claims 1, 36, 39, or 46, and therefore are believed to be allowable over Java SE in view of Chen, and further in view of Friedman at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Java SE in view of Chen and in view of Friedman and further in view of Chakraborty

Claim 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Java SE in view of Chen, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0188613 issued to Chakraborty et al. (“Chakraborty”).

Claim 19 depends from independent claim 1, and thus, at least by virtue of its dependence from an allowable base claim, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is also allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles W. Gray/

Charles W. Gray
Reg. No. 61,345

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
CWG:cmb

61857494 v1